A weight of evidence framework outlining criteria for weighing measurement endpoints and lines of evidence. The relative importance of the weighting criteria are also established (TBD).		Weighting Criteria for Measurement Endpoints	Considerations	Ranking Relative to Considerations				
Considerations	**Weighting for Relative Importance of Measurement Endpoint Evaluation Criteria**	**Relevance of Measure to Assessment Endpoint**		**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
	?	**Exposure Pathway**	Degree to which exposure is relevant to the assessment endpoint	Exposure pathway is weakly associated with the assessment endpoint				Exposure pathway is highly relevant to assessment endpoint
	?	**Measurement Endpoint**	Degree to which the measurement endpoint is a direct estimate of the assessment endpoint or if validation studies have demonstrated that the measurement endpoint is predictive of the assessment	Measurement endpoint is indirectly linked to the assessment endpoint				Measurement endpoint is the assessment endpoint (e.g. measure of growth, mortality or reproduction)
	?	**Exposure Assessment**		**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
		Temporal Representation	Encompasses the relevant range of temporal variance of conditions; number of measurement or sampling events over time	Exposure data represents a single sampling event or limited time scale relative to variability				Data collected represents several different temporal scales relevant to variability in exposure (e.g. seasonal changes; tidal fluxes)
	?	**Spatial Scope / Coverage**	Data adequate to represent the geographic area being assessed; degree of compatibility between the study area, locations of measurements or samples, co-location of stressors, and locations of ecological receptors and their points of exposure	Exposure data represents a larger scale than that over which receptor exposure occurs				Exposure data collected on the scale over which receptor exposure occurs
	?	**Quality of Exposure Data**	Data on exposure considered to be of high quality. Considerations are accuracy, precision, analytical detection limits and study design	Low Quality				High Quality

	?	**Quantity of Exposure Data**	Results based on small sample sizes are given less weight than those based on large sample sizes relative to the potential variance	Data set limited; sample size small enough that data should be examined qualitatively		Results quantitative, but data are insufficient to test for statistical significance between locations.		Number of samples sufficient to estimate exposure with confidence; may be tested for statistical significance between locations
	?	**Effects Assessment**		1	2	3	4	5
		Site Specificity	Degree to which effects are measured on a site specific basis	Effects literature based; data not empirically derived nor validated to occur at the site		Effects laboratory based; effects not field validated to occur at the site		Effects empirically derived at the site or validated to occur (e.g. field validation of laboratory results)
	?	**Exposure / Response Relationship**	Degree to which a relationship between magnitude of exposure and effects has been established	No relationship between magnitude of exposure and effects		Magnitude of response qualitatively or weakly linked to exposure		Reliable, statistical relationship between magnitude of exposure and effects
	?	**Quality of Effects Data**	Adequate protocols for sampling, analysis, testing and study design; degree to which standard methods were used	Standard methods not used				Standard methods and protocols used
	?	**Quantity of Effects Data**	*Literature Based* : The degree to which there is a paucity of literature data on effects; *Empirically Derived Effects* : Effects data sufficient relative to variability to est. effects with appropriate confidence	Literature Data Limited; Empirical effects variable in response				*Literature* : Sufficient literature data to establish effects threshold; *Empirically Derived;* Data enough for statistical comparisons; or predict with an appropriate level of confidence